UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/551,681 | 09/29/2005 | Yoshio Okamoto | 3400.P1423US | 5563 |
| | 7590 09/23/200 L BOUTELL & TANIS | EXAMINER | | |
| 2026 RAMBLING ROAD | | | JOHNSON, EDWARD M | |
| KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1793 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/23/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/551,681 | OKAMOTO ET AL. | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | Edward M. Johnson | 1793 | |
|--|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>31 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered be | Called |
| (a) \square The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, \square | | | cause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | 50.01.7, | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or | ** | ducing or simplifying tl | ne issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1) | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| 4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10. | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (| PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| 13. | | | |
| | /Edward M. Johnson/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1793 | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendment would specify that the claimed groups are bonded "to each other," which would be a new issue requiring further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is argued that on page 3... paragraph [0044]. This is not persuasive because Applicant appears to admit that the an epoxy is disclosed, arguing only that the intended use thereof is not as a separating agent. However, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

It is argued that the Onishi reference discloses... separation of isomers. This is not persuasive because Onishi discloses a stationary phase, which would inherently or at least obviously suggest a porous carrier to an ordinarily skilled artisan.